

## **REMARKS**

**[0003]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-27, 29, 31-33 and 35-44 are presently pending. Claims 1, 17, 19-27, 29, and 31-33 are amended herein. Claims 18-19, 28, 30 and 34 are cancelled herein. No new claims have been added.

### **Formal Request for an Interview**

**[0004]** If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

**[0005]** Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

### **Claim Amendments**

**[0006]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 17, 19-27, 29, and 31-33 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the

claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

**[0007]** Claims 1, 17 and 33 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claim 34. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 17 and 33 are found in the specification at least at pages 16 and 18.

### **Formal Matters**

**[0008]** This section addresses any formal matters (e.g., objections) raised by the Examiner.

#### **Title**

**[0009]** The Examiner objects to the Title as not being descriptive. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection, but in an attempt to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the Title as shown above.

#### **Abstract**

**[0010]** The Examiner objects to the Abstract for including the phrase "implementations are described and claimed herein to enable". Herein, Applicant amends the Abstract, as shown above, to amend the abstract to reflect the Examiner's suggestion.

## **Claim**

[0011] The Examiner objects to claim 33 as failing to include a terminating period. Herein, Applicant amends claim 33, as shown above, to correct the informality noted by the Examiner.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 101**

[0012] Claims 17-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Furthermore, in light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of §101 and that the §101 rejections should be withdrawn. Applicant further asserts that these claims are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections. Support for the amendments, namely the changing of the term "computer program product encoding" with the term "computer readable storage media", can be found at least at pages 25-29 and more specifically at paragraph [0084].

[0013] If the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims, then Applicant requests additional guidance as to what is necessary to overcome the rejection.

### **Claim Rejections under § 103**

**[0014]** Claims 1, 2, 4-18 and 20-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0171872 issued to Burch et al. in view of Brovick et al. ("Windows® 2000 Active Directory TM").

**[0015]** Claims 3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch in view of Brovick in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029214 issued to Yianilos.

**[0016]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[0017] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

### **Independent Claim 1**

[0018] Applicant submits that the combination of Burch and Brovick does not render obvious at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "enumerating local credentials and remote credentials in response to receiving an event notification, **wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event**"

[0019] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 8, in rejecting claim 34) the following with regard to this feature:

Regarding claim 34, Burch and Brovick taught that the event notification is at least one of the following: a session event, a logon event, a logout event, a lock event, an unlock event, a timer event, a policy application event, and a credential update event (See Burch Paragraph 0046).

[0020] Burch, paragraph [0046] states:

[0046] Conversely, some new or modified identity information can be inserted or changed by the principal within the principal credential store, at 123, and according to the synchronization policy automatically communicated to the identity service and updated to

the enterprise credential store. An update to the enterprise credential store will force the identity service to update the effected records in the appropriate identity stores.

**[0021]** As can be seen from carefully reading paragraph [0046], Burch does not teach or suggest an “event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event” as presently claimed in independent claim 1. Instead, Burch only teaches that new or modified identification information can be inserted by the principal credential store upon the update to the enterprise credential store. This triggering event, the change to the enterprise store, does not suggest or teach an event notification that “is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event.” As such, the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

### **Dependent Claims 2-16**

**[0022]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

## **Independent Claim 17**

**[0023]** Applicant submits that the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest each element as recited in this claim. As noted with regard to independent claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest an “event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event” as recited in independent claim 17, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 17.

**[0024]** Additionally, the cited art of record fails to teach a synchronizing module as recited in independent claim 17, as amended. The cited art namely fails to teach a synchronizing module that “sorts the local credentials and the remote credentials into a local credential array and a remote credential array respectively and linearly compares the local credential array and the remote credential array” and “stores a state file for conflict resolution.” Even further, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a state file that comprises “a file version; a flag; and a credential state” as recited in claim 17, as amended. Support for these amendments to claim 17 can be found at least at paragraphs [0049] through [0051] of the present application.

**[0025]** As the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

### **Dependent Claims 20-27, 29 and 31-32**

[0026] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

### **Independent Claim 33**

[0027] Applicant submits that the combination of Burch and Brovick does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “a synchronizing module operatively associated with the event handler to synchronize local credentials and remote credentials when the event handler receives an event notification and if the local and remote credentials are different from one another, **wherein the event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event**”

[0028] As noted with regard to independent claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest an “event notification is at least one of the following: a session event; a logon event; a logout event; a lock event; an unlock event; a timer event; a policy application event” as recited in independent claim 33, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 33.



## **Dependent Claims 35-44**

[0029] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

## **Dependent Claims**

[0030] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

## **Conclusion**

[0031] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representatives for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/

Dated: 2008-10-08

Jason F. Lindh ([jason@leehayes.com](mailto:jason@leehayes.com); x215)

Registration No. 59,090

Kayla D. Brant ([kayla@leehayes.com](mailto:kayla@leehayes.com); x242)

Registration No. 46576

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)